

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 27, 2005. Claims 5, 7, 9, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23 to 26 and 28 to 32 remain pending in the application, of which Claims 5, 7, 9, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 28 and 32 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 15 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,855,006 (Huemoeller) in view of and article to Cooper, Claims 7 and 17 were rejected under § 103(a) over Huemoeller in view of Cooper, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,848,395 (Edgar) and an article to Anonymous, Claims 9 and 19 were rejected under § 103(a) over Huemoeller in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,050,077 (Vincent) and further in view of Cooper and Anonymous, Claims 23, 28 and 32 were rejected under § 103(a) over Huemoeller in view of Anonymous, and Claims 24 to 26 and 29 to 31 were rejected under § 103(a) over Huemoeller in view of Anonymous and further in view of Edgar and Vincent. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention of independent Claims 5, 7, 9, 15, 17, 19, and 21 searches for a pending task to be performed by a user within a predetermined timeframe of a time when an ending instruction is received from a user for instructing an information processing apparatus to terminate a use of the apparatus by the user. The user is then notified of the pending task. As a result, when the user logs-out of a computer, they can be reminded of upcoming tasks in their schedule that are to be performed within a predetermined timeframe of the time that the user logs-out.

With specific reference to the claims, independent Claim 5 is an information processing apparatus comprising a receiver that receives an ending instruction from a user for instructing the apparatus to terminate a use of the apparatus by the user, a search unit that searches for a pending task to be performed by the user within a predetermined timeframe of the time when the receiver receives the ending instruction from the user, and a notifier that notifies the user of the pending task to be performed within the predetermined timeframe when the pending task is found by the search unit.

Amended independent Claims 15 and 21 are method and computer medium claims, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 5.

Amended independent Claim 7 is an information processing apparatus comprising a receiver that receives an ending instruction from a user for instructing the apparatus to terminate a use of the apparatus by the user, an inferring unit that infers a destination of the user based on a user's schedule when the receiver receives the ending instruction from the user, a search unit that searches for a pending task relevant to the inferred destination of the user and to be performed within a predetermined timeframe of the time when the receiver receives the ending instruction from the user, and a notifier that notifies the user of the pending task relevant to the destination of the user.

Amended independent Claim 17 is a method claim substantially corresponding to Claim 7.

Amended independent Claim 9 is an information processing apparatus comprising a receiver that receives an ending instruction from a user for instructing the apparatus to terminate a use of the apparatus by the user, an inferring unit that infers a

person with whom the user is scheduled to meet based on a user's schedule when the receiver receives the ending instruction from the user, a search unit that searches for a pending task relevant to the person with whom the user is scheduled to meet within a predetermined timeframe of the time when the receiver receives the ending instruction from the user, and a notifier that notifies the user of the pending task relevant to the person with whom the user is scheduled to meet.

Amended independent Claim 19 is a method claim substantially corresponding to Claim 9.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of independent Claims 5, 7, 9, 15, 17, 19 and 21. More particularly, the applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of searching for a pending task to be performed by a user within a predetermined timeframe of a time when an ending instruction is received from a user to terminate a use of an apparatus by the user (as claimed in Claims 5, 15 and 21), or searching for a pending task relevant to an inferred destination of the user and that is to be performed within a predetermined timeframe of a time when an ending instruction is received from a user to terminate a use of an apparatus by the user (as claimed in Claims 7 and 17), or searching for a pending task relevant to a person, inferred from a user's schedule, with whom the user is scheduled to meet within a predetermined timeframe of a time when an ending instruction is received from a user to terminate a use of an apparatus by the user (as claimed in Claims 9 and 19).

Huemoeller merely discloses that a user turns on an alarm function for a scheduled event and selects the type of alarm indication to be provided. The alarm

function is triggered at a predetermined amount of time before the event as set by the user. (Column 6, lines 35 to 48). Thus, Huemoeller merely notifies a user of a pending task that is set in the schedule, where the notification is triggered by the alarm. If the user were to log-out of the computer before the time that the alarm is set to sound, the user would not be reminded of the pending task. That is, there is nothing in Huemoeller in which a search is performed for pending tasks when the user logs-out so that the user can be informed of the pending task(s). In contrast, in the present invention, the search is performed (i.e., is triggered by) when an ending instruction is received from a user to terminate a use of the apparatus by the user. When the search is performed, it is performed based on the time that the ending instruction is received so that pending tasks to be performed within a predetermined timeframe of the time when the ending instruction is received can be notified to the user. Therefore, Huemoeller clearly does not disclose or suggest the features of Claims 5, 15 and 21, Claims 7 and 17, or Claims 9 and 19.

Cooper is not seen to add anything to overcome the foregoing deficiencies of Huemoeller. In this regard, the Office Action merely asserts that the use of dialog boxes to present warnings when an application is closed is old and well known in the art and cites Cooper for this proposition. Even if this were true, such a disclosure clearly fails to provide any specifics as to a type of dialog warning, and specifically fails to disclose or to suggest that a warning is presented of the type claimed in Claims 5, 15 and 21 (namely, searching for a pending task to be performed by a user within a predetermined timeframe of a time when an ending instruction is received from a user to terminate a use of an

apparatus by the user, and notifying the user of the same). Accordingly, Claims 5, 15 and 21, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be allowable.

Regarding Claims 7 and 17, none of Cooper, Edgar or Anonymous are seen to add anything to overcome the foregoing deficiencies of Huemoeller. In this regard, Cooper's disclosure is as discussed above. Edgar is merely seen to disclose an appointment booking and scheduling system that stores routes of an operative and jobs to be performed on the route. Anonymous is merely seen to disclose organizing similar tasks to be done in a day's work schedule. However, none of Cooper, Edgar or Anonymous, are seen to disclose or to suggest anything that, when combined with Huemoeller, would have resulted in at least the feature of searching for a pending task relevant to an inferred destination of the user and that is to be performed within a predetermined timeframe of a time when an ending instruction is received from a user to terminate a use of an apparatus by the user. Accordingly, independent Claims 7 and 17, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be allowable.

With regard to Claims 9 and 19, Huemoeller, Cooper and Anonymous are seen to disclose that described above. Vincent is merely seen to disclose a meeting scheduler that compares input data for a meeting invitee with previously scheduled data of the invitee. However, any permissible combination of Huemoeller, Cooper, Vincent and/or Anonymous, would not have resulted in at least the feature of searching for a pending task relevant to a person, inferred from a user's schedule, with whom the user is scheduled to meet within a predetermined timeframe of a time when an ending instruction is received

from a user to terminate a use of an apparatus by the user. Accordingly, independent Claims 9 and 19, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be allowable.

Independent Claims 23, 28 and 32 also concern notifying a user of a pending task, but the notification is performed when a new task is added to a schedule. According the invention, when a new task to be performed by a user is added to the schedule, a search is performed for a previously scheduled pending task relevant to the new task being added. The user is then notified of the pending task when the pending task is found as a result of the search. As a result, whenever a schedule is modified to add a new task to be performed by the user, the user is reminded of previously scheduled pending tasks relevant to the added task.

Referring specifically to the claims, independent Claim 23 is an information processing apparatus comprising a schedule storage, for storing a plurality of pending tasks to be performed by a user, an entry adder, that adds a new task to be performed by the user to the schedule storage, a search unit that searches the schedule storage for a previously scheduled pending task relevant to the new task when the entry adder adds the new task, and a notifier that notifies a user of the pending task relevant to the new task when the pending task is found by the search unit.

Independent Claims 28 and 32 are method and computer medium claims, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 23.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of independent Claims 23, 28 and 32. More particularly, the applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of searching a schedule storage of tasks to be performed by

a user for a previously scheduled pending task relevant to a new task to be performed by the user when the new task is added to the schedule storage, and notifying the user of the pending task relevant to the new task when the pending task is found.

Huemoeller's column 2, lines 12 to 16 merely states that, when a user is scheduling a new activity, such as a public entertainment event, various information needed to schedule the activity is presented to the user (e.g., a listing of ticket prices, seating chart, etc.). Thus, when the user is adding the new activity, the user is presented with additional information (but not related tasks already in the schedule) to assist in adding the activity. Thus, the additional information is clearly not a previously scheduled task to be performed by the user, and is not a previously scheduled pending task that is relevant to the new task being added.

Anonymous, as described above, is merely seen to disclose organizing work tasks for day's work schedule. However, any permissible combination of Huemoeller and Anonymous would not have resulted in at least the feature of searching a schedule storage of tasks to be performed by a user for a previously scheduled pending task relevant to a new task to be performed by the user when the new task is added to the schedule storage, and notifying the user of the pending task relevant to the new task when the pending task is found. Therefore, independent Claims 23, 28 and 32, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be allowable.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,
California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to
our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Edward A. Kmett', written over a horizontal line.

Edward A. Kmett
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-22
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 103882v1